DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 059 SP 037 848

AUTHOR Vare, Jonatha W.
TITLE Research as Relationship: Ethics and School-University Collaboration.
PUB DATE 1997-01-00
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Qualitative Research in Education (10th, Athens, GA, January 9-11, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethics; Feminism; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Educators; Teacher Researchers; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Inquiry; Poststructuralism

ABSTRACT

This paper illustrates a researcher/teacher's "situated," (using the workplace as a cultural context) and "gendered" (following the female's subjective preference for context and relationship) understanding of ethics and school-university collaboration. It discusses two ethical issues that arise when school and university colleagues work in collaborative relationships. The paper describes three areas of complication resulting from school-university collaboration; discusses three assumptions of poststructural, feminist research and how they relate to the democratization of qualitative research; and draws implications for ethical issues in collaborative inquiry within the context of caring relationships among colleagues from different workplace cultures. Data come from the researcher/teacher's experiences over several years as a collaborative inquirer in various projects involving school and university faculty. Data sources include field notes, analytic memos from participant observation, reflective journals, focus groups interviews with teachers and university faculty, students' papers, and site artifacts. Complications related to school-university collaboration included school-university workplace cultural differences, situated practice giving rise to situated understanding, and dual role relationships of school-university collaborators. Poststructural, feminist assumptions about qualitative inquiry included the researcher/teacher seeking decentered knowledge, empowerment being problematic, and the aim of inquiry being dialogue. The two ethical implications arising from the complications in school-university collaboration and the assumptions of poststructural, feminist research are that the collaborative relationship must be a caring one and that intellectual honesty is necessary for the democratization of inquiry. (Contains 31 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

ED 418 059

Research as Relationship:
Ethics and School-University Collaboration

Jonatha W. Vare, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor
304L Withers/WTS
College of Education
Winthrop University
Rock Hill, SC 29733

(803) 323-2476 (Office)
(803) 323-2585 (FAX)
varej@winthrop.edu

J Vare

Paper Presented
at the
10th Annual International Conference on Qualitative Research in Education
"Democratizing Inquiry Through Qualitative Research"
The University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia
January 9-11, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP037848

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

My contemplation of ethical issues in qualitative research began in 1990 when, as part of my doctoral comprehensive written examinations, a committee member asked me to respond to a question about ethics in qualitative research. At the time, I believed my answer was a well-written essay based on thoughtful analysis of the American Anthropological Association's code of ethics, various researchers' descriptions of ethical dilemmas encountered in qualitative research, and current psychological theory about gender differences in the resolution of moral dilemmas (e.g., Gilligan, 1982). The committee member's response to my answer surprised me. During a postcomprehensive debriefing session, he commented, "Your answer is fine, but what I want to know is this. When you're faced with an ethical dilemma during a research project, what are you going to do?" At a loss to respond further, I replied, "I don't know. It depends on the situation."

In the six or seven years following that interchange I have deepened my reflective analysis of the issues raised by the committee member's question. As a university professor, my roles include teaching, research, and service, and their philosophical underpinnings are united by the common themes I describe in this paper. Since the time of my doctoral comprehensive examinations, I have experienced personal dilemmas as an assistant professor involved in collaborative projects with university and public school colleagues. Subsequent readings and reflective analyses have led me to characterize my subjectivity as a researcher and as teacher within several frames of poststructural, feminist positions such as those of Harding (1986; 1991) and Luke and Gore (1992). In hindsight, I see now that my initial answer to the doctoral committee member reveals an intuitive predilection for responding to ethical dilemmas based on the particular contextual factors involved. In that sense I am true to my gender, following the female's subjective preference for context and relationship as described, for example, by Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984; 1992). Thus, my understanding is "gendered" (Harding, 1986). It is also "situated" (Lave, 1990; Lave & Wenger, 1991), the product of my workplace as a cultural context.

In this paper I illustrate my situated, gendered understanding as a researcher and teacher through an analysis of several reflective journal responses represented by the three selections that follow. I find that my self-definition as a poststructural,

feminist researcher is inevitably connected to my evolving philosophy of teaching as feminist pedagogy. Thus, in preparing the following discussion, at this point in my career as a university professor I find that I am unable to separate discussions of my researcher and teacher selves.

This paper presents an overview of my theoretical view of collaborative inquiry and discusses two ethical issues that arise when colleagues from school and university settings work in collaborative relationships. There are three purposes: (1) to present three areas of complication that arise in school-university collaboration; (2) to discuss three assumptions of poststructural, feminist research and how they relate to the democratization of qualitative research; and (3) to draw two implications for ethical issues in collaborative inquiry within the context of caring relationships that occur among colleagues from different workplace cultures.

Method

The ideas in this paper are based on analysis of my experiences as a university professor who taught both undergraduate and graduate courses for five years and who served as a collaborative inquirer in several different projects over the past three years. Each project involved collaboration among two or more university faculty and groups of 10-20 public school teachers. Triangulation in data collection involved use of field notes and analytic memos from my participant observation and reflective journals, focus group interviews with small groups of teachers, interviews with teachers and university faculty, and collection of site artifacts such as written responses to open-ended reflection questions, learning logs constructed by participants as records of daily activities, and other documents produced by participants during the course of the projects. I coded field notes, transcripts of interviews, and various site documents, wrote preliminary analyses, and sought participant checks of preliminary descriptions and analyses. Also, during the past five years, I have collected copies of students' papers and maintained reflective analyses of self-growth in pedagogy.

In the following discussion, I refer to events described in three reflective journal selections to illustrate particular points. I, therefore, include the journal selections here in chronological order. Each selection is headed by a title composed

recently to summarize my current view of how the theme of the selection relates to this paper.

Selection #1: Going Native

November 1994: The two months of September and October 1994 have been the most difficult of my newly begun career as a college professor. A university colleague and I have obtained two grants to promote the study of middle schools and the development of a middle level teacher education program. This fall we began to teach a course in which colleagues from two of our professional development schools (PDSs) enrolled as course participants. A major purpose of the course was to produce recommendations for the preservice preparation of teachers for middle schools using the expertise of our PDS colleagues. In hindsight, we see now that our great mistake was in combining the traditional idea of a course with collaborative work involving our PDS teachers. Due to the structure of the syllabus and course requirements, an intense and instantaneous collision of workplace cultural values has resulted. My university colleague, a veteran professor of over eleven years, insists that academic integrity requires high standards and product-based evaluation, whereas my PDS colleagues sense that their trust in the school-university partnership and sense of professionalism have been violated by having their university "partners" serve as their evaluators. Whose ideals should prevail? I am caught in the middle. I have no solution to this dilemma. Regardless of how the various course requirements might be negotiated, I am torn as I try to decide. As a former teacher for twelve years, I possess the experiential base to understand the PDS teachers' position. As a current assistant professor, I feel that I must also attempt to understand and respect the principles unique to academe as represented by my university colleague; in fact, I feel ethically bound to develop this new experiential base. When I began the pursuit of doctoral study, I made my choice and commitment to profess. I have gone from one native land to another, yet I feel the pull of conflicting loyalties. I have no guidance in how to make my ethical choices when workplace cultures collide. I want to know who else inhabits this middle native ground.

Selection #2: Research as Relationship

February 1996: For several months I have been engaged in a new research project. I have been invited to conduct participant observation of the change process in a collaborative effort to achieve educational reform. I have been working with teachers and a university colleague to study the professional collaborative culture as it evolves in the project. We have all been excited by the sense of renewal engendered in the participants by this project. I am now collaborating with the university colleague to analyze our beginning data and write an initial paper about our work. My frustration is this. Our most interesting finding is one that I am not allowed to document because my colleague will not give his permission. I have read in the AAA's (1996) code of ethics that the protection of subjects is always paramount, but I have never before found myself in the uncomfortable position of having to suppress data due to ethical considerations. My colleague says that I am allowed to talk about the findings in question when I make presentations, but I am not to commit the findings in question to writing and, thus, to print. I understand my colleague's position and remain committed ethically to the restrictions, but the suppression of knowledge nags at my conscience.

Selection #3: Pedagogy of the Unoppressed

December 1996: This fall I have been especially challenged in my thinking by two young "white" men in one of my graduate classes. We have been reading Sonia Nieto's Affirming Diversity as one text in the class, and these particular two young men, representatives of the "dominant culture," have repeatedly, with fervent emotion and intelligent articulation, resisted most of the ideas presented in Nieto's text, though each in different ways and with different rationales. One, a former member of a branch of the U. S. armed forces, makes an appointment to see me and confides that he feels uncomfortable making comments during seminar discussions about the cases of students presented in the Nieto text. He says, "I'm afraid I'll sound like a racist." We briefly discuss the case of "Avi Abramson," a Jewish student, and the issues of silencing involved in that case. Suddenly he says, "That's it! I'm feel like I'm being silenced in your class." This remark produces a moment of extreme clarity for me. I assure him that he can choose to disagree with ideas presented in the text and with other ideas discussed in class, that I expect him to think critically, and that he can disagree with no penalty to his grade. He does. Subsequent papers submitted by the young man present increasingly thoughtful critiques of the ideas presented in the readings and introspective analyses of his personal experiences and how they contribute to his philosophy of education. I am enabled through his articulation to see a different vision of the world through his eyes. Later, when I watch a televised version of Clint Eastwood's performance in Heartbreak Ridge (1987), I think to myself, "Now I understand. I understand how and why this student claims moral opposition to the idea of affirming diversity."

In the remainder of this paper I use the events described above in the three journal selections to illustrate certain points. First, I describe three complexities of collaboration between school and university personnel. These complexities reflect features unique to our respective workplace cultures, a particular contextual complication that contributes to the ethical dilemmas inherent in school-university collaboration. Second, I explain three assumptions that I make as a poststructural, feminist researcher and teacher. I show how these assumptions are reflected in the actions and dilemmas of my researcher-teacher self. Finally, I discuss two ethical implications that research relationships and workplace differences hold for those involved in school-university collaboration.

Some Complications of School-University Collaboration

University professors who collaborate in various inquiry projects with colleagues in school and university settings are subject to certain situational factors that complicate their work. Specifically, three complications arise from the particular contextual nature of school-university collaborative relationships. These derive largely from the workplace cultural differences in school and university

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

settings and from the dual role relationships involved in school-university collaboration.

School-university workplace cultural differences exist.

School-university collaborators come from different workplace cultures, and these cultural differences hold profound implications for their collaborative work. In their review of research, Brookhart and Loadman (1990; 1992) show convincingly that the "workplace" or "organizational" cultures of schools and universities are distinct. Workplace cultures include special modes of how persons view and perform their work such as work tempo, work focus, rewards for work, and the degree of power and autonomy (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; 1992). Differences in workplace cultures manifest themselves in certain contrasts. University personnel, for example, traditionally place high value upon research, theoretical concerns, and academic freedom in their job settings. In contrast, the priorities of school personnel are often oriented toward immediately practical applications in their own work settings where they have little time to engage in inquiry during the work day.

Workplace cultural differences contribute to collaborators entering the relationship with different goals and statuses (Million & Vare, 1995). At times differences are so pronounced that collaboration between school and university personnel might be termed a special case of culture shock (Million & Vare, 1995). Indeed, numerous case reports of conflicts in school-university collaborative projects exist (e.g., Fear, 1991; Feldman, 1992; Parish, Underwood, & Eubanks, 1986-87; Stoddart, 1993; Teitel, 1991). As journal selection #1 illustrates, conflict can occur because personnel from the two institutions bring different mixes of statuses and goals to collaborative relationships. This is to be expected because the underlying cultural assumptions of schools and universities differ markedly. My university colleague and I discovered this when we became enmeshed in a conflict with our professional development school (PDS) colleagues. Creation of a school-university partnership in 1992 engendered a corresponding, but unexplored, change in our work roles. We encountered complexities that we had not expected. The partnership added a presumed relation of parity (i.e., equal status) and shared goals, yet we simultaneously continued a traditional teacher-student relationship with our

PDS colleagues in which partners possessed different goals and statuses. Once we reflected upon the collaborative conflict, we realized how our different workplace cultures contributed to partners entering the collaborative relationship with differing behaviors and values. We continue to reflect critically upon our collaborative endeavors with the goal of understanding how we may achieve true relations of parity with our partnership colleagues.

Other researchers have written about similar experiences. Feldman (1992), for example, describes a collaborative research project in which the goals of the project diverged along two separate paths, each dictated by the concerns of university and school personnel. In solution, Feldman (1992) proposes collaboration through "separation," an idea which acknowledges that school-university workplace cultural differences exist. Rather than expound a view of colleagues from differing workplaces cultures "collaborating through separation," I choose the view that situated practice gives rise to situated understanding. We should expect the goals and status mixes of colleagues from schools and universities to differ, and we should incorporate in our work an attempt to understand how those differences contribute to the process and results of our collaboration.

Situated practice gives rise to situated understanding.

One necessary feature of collaborative work should be the acknowledgment at the outset that differences exist and that those differences should be expected to contribute to the process and outcomes of the collaborative work. It is reasonable to expect that the work of school and university collaborators comprises two distinct situated practices and that each will give rise to a different situated understanding. A theory of situated learning reflects the view that all activity is situated; that is, learning derives from practice in a social context in which meanings are negotiated and problem solving is dilemma-driven (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Feldman's (1992) description of a school-university collaborative research project illustrates differences in situated learning. University researchers conducted a case study of how teachers use certain representations in their work; this was the goal of the research identified by the professors. In contrast, during the process of conducting the actual research project, the teachers developed the goal of studying a discrepancy

identified in their teaching practice --"the gap between their goal to encourage their students to develop a conceptual understanding of physics on the one hand, and their students' identification of physics as mathematical problem solving on the other" (Feldman, 1992, p. 10). Each collaborator's perspective derives from the activity and dilemmas of situated work. In the instance documented by Feldman (1992), university personnel sought to understand the work of teachers from the perspective of constructing theory about how their work is effectively accomplished. Teachers' questions, on the other hand, arose from dilemmas encountered in their daily work with their own students, such as why students' goals in knowledge construction differ from those posed by the teacher. Neither perspective is preferable to the other, but each is necessarily grounded in the collaborator's respective work activity. Part of our work as collaborators should be the goal of understanding each other's respective situated practice.

School-university collaborators often engage in dual role relationships.

A third complication arises because school-university collaborators often engage in dual role relationships. Dual roles are those in which a person holds more than one relationship with another. Examples of multiple roles that one person could hold in a relationship with another person include researcher, teacher, administrator, friend, and family member. Dual roles complicate relationships because they entail power differentials (such as those between administrators and subordinates or between teachers and students) and subject a person to multiple and sometimes conflicting allegiances. This is how I felt when I was in transition from work in my former career as a teacher to a new career as an assistant professor. I describe my perception of conflicting allegiances in selection #1, "Going Native."

Collaborative inquiry is a process complicated by the prospect of researchers engaging in dual role relationships. It is possible that a university professor may hold simultaneous relationships of researcher, teacher, administrator, friend, and family member with collaborating school or university colleagues. Some psychologists view all dual role relationships as "ethically problematic" because they have the potential for harm (Kitchener, 1988). Kitchener (1988) advises that professionals engaged in dual role relationships have certain obligations: (1) to be

aware that differing role expectations and obligations may cause conflict and perceived loss of objectivity and (2) "to minimize the potential for harm" by clarifying differing expectations and obligations and developing "procedures for maintaining the interests" of others as primary (p. 220).

It is well to heed precautions such as Kitchener's (1988). As I acknowledged, though, in the introduction to this paper, dilemmas are fraught with conflict and their precise solutions are never prescribed in advance; rather, they emerge from a particular contextual mix. Researchers have available ethical guidelines such as those issued by the American Anthropological Association (1996) which assert that in qualitative inquiry the protection of persons involved in the research is primary over the researcher's mission to advance knowledge. However, when persons are engaged in dual role relationships, the issue of who decides "what is in the best interests of the people studied" is complicated by multiple layers of responsibility (AAA Committee on Ethics, 1996, p. 14). The ethical obligations of persons involved in collaborative research may conflict. Persons may owe allegiance to more than one professional or personal code of ethics, and role conflicts can arise when "expectations associated with one role require behavior of a person that is to some extent incompatible with behavior associated with another role" (Kitchener, 1988, p. 218). In events described in selection #1, my university colleague and I felt the pull of conflicting allegiances--one to the ethical standards of academic integrity and another to the inherent relation of parity demanded by a school-university partnership. Our dilemma came when we were forced to give one priority over the other. The involvement of school-university collaborators in dual role relationships adds a special layer of complication to the resolution of ethical dilemmas.

Some Poststructural, Feminist Assumptions about Qualitative Inquiry

I have described three aspects of school and university work that complicate collaboration between personnel from the two institutions. Before I draw ethical implications from these complexities, it is necessary to present a brief overview of my ideological position as a researcher, collaborator, and teacher. I characterize my

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

position as a poststructural, feminist one, and I make certain base assumptions about qualitative inquiry.

In this section I also describe what is inherently democratic about qualitative research from a poststructural, feminist position. To do this I outline three basic assumptions about qualitative inquiry within a poststructural, feminist frame. I illustrate each assumption by referring to instances in the journal selections. In my discussion of the assumptions and examples, I show how the collaborative work is complicated by workplace cultural differences, situated practices, and engagement in dual role relationships.

Assumption One: The researcher-teacher seeks decentered knowledge.

As a collaborative, qualitative researcher (and teacher), I frame my position from Harding's (1991) poststructural, feminist standpoint of "strong objectivity," that is, one which recognizes that knowledge is both gendered and socially and historically situated. From this philosophical ground, I seek to deconstruct and critique my subjectivity (Luke & Gore, 1992), to "decenter" my perspective as researcher and teacher (Harding, 1986), and to understand the historically situated positions of those with whom I collaborate to conduct inquiry. Thus, my epistemology is a standpoint grounded on "a foundation of difference" (Luke & Gore, 1992, p. 7), one which provides opportunities for celebration of the relationships that promote decentered knowledge because they allow differences to emerge.

My quest is one for "decentered knowledge" (Harding, 1986). To seek decentered knowledge is to understand the interplay of subjectivity and objectivity in qualitative inquiry or how the researcher and the researched (or the teacher and the taught) jointly construct meaning. To understand one's subjectivity is to acknowledge that researchers (or teachers) cannot " 'bracket' (that is, hold in abeyance) their own judgments, beliefs, norms, and standards while studying" or teaching the other (Nielsen, 1990, p. 27). To seek "strong objectivity" is to engage in a systematic analysis of how macro and micro forces contribute to the construction of such "powerful background beliefs" in both self and other (Harding, 1991, p. 149). Systematic analysis of subjectivity and objectivity is the goal and method of

decentered knowledge.

In my experience as a university professor, the most powerful transformation in my progress toward decentered knowledge in collaborative inquiry occurred during the events described in selection #1 above when a university colleague and I began to examine closely our own behavior and values in our roles as university brokers of school-university partnerships at two middle schools (Million & Vare, 1994). We began a systematic self-analysis of how our values and behavior as university partners are molded by the culture in which we work and why they may and do conflict with certain values and behaviors of our professional development school colleagues. We realize now that different "workplace cultures" contribute to the formation of different professional values and behaviors (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; 1992) and that these differences must be acknowledged and confronted in public dialogue if effective collaboration is to occur. The conflict that occurred between ourselves as university brokers and our professional development school colleagues transformed my perspective, enabling me to view our collaborative work from the perspectives of both school and university collaborators. Yet, the transformation created a tension between perspectives which has yet to be resolved. This leads me to assumption number two.

Assumption Two: The question of empowerment is problematic.

Poststructural, feminist research seeks empowerment through deconstruction of motive and construction of decentered knowledge rather than through the critical ends of emancipatory research. As a collaborative researcher framed within a poststructural, feminist standpoint, I critique the assumptions of explicitly "emancipatory research" (Lather, 1986). I question the assumption that "research as praxis" should identify and change a "maldistribution of power and resources" to help create a more just world (Lather, 1986, p. 258). Critical theory as emancipatory research or pedagogy seeks to identify the dominated and to empower the disenfranchised through knowledge that research generates about ways in which unjust power relations reproduce power differentials (Luke & Gore, 1992). As a poststructural, feminist researcher and teacher, I reject the liberatory perspective of critical emancipatory research. I view the question of empowerment as problematic

when empowerment is construed as an action that presupposes an end and a direction for both the dominant and the dominated (Luke & Gore, 1992; Nielsen, 1990). Indeed, I now view the labeling of the dominant and the dominated as itself problematic.

Poststructural, feminist, qualitative research deconstructs its motives for inquiry as well as its situated and genderized knowledge construction, recognizing that research is "an ethical and political act" (Roman & Apple, 1990, p. 41). I recognize that one must interrogate all aspects of the research (and teaching) relationship because all power relations constitute potentially "politically transformative" epistemologies (Roman & Apple, 1990, p. 39). I ask, for example, on what premise do I invite or accept collaboration? What is the basis of my self-interest (Lugones & Spelman, 1983)? I question the presumption that our joint inquiry will necessarily empower the disenfranchised, and, further, I question the act of labeling certain persons as "the disenfranchised." Like others who critique the assumptions of critical theorists, I recognize the "misconception" that power is a property which can be shared (Gore, 1992). Rather, I follow Foucault's (1980) view that power is constituted in a network of actions. Thus, I view empowerment in collaborative inquiry as a process in which co-laborers attempt to understand how their actions mutually construct the research project. Subsequent qualitative analysis of situated empowerment works to deconstruct the gendered and historically constituted power/knowledge relations and their ethical implications. It is the "consciousness-raising" produced by increased understanding that leads to empowerment and emancipation from the blindness of a limited perspective (Nielsen, 1990), and each situated perspective generates its own limits to be overcome.

An example from my teaching described in journal selection #3, "Pedagogy of the Unoppressed," illustrates this assumption. In the situation described in this journal entry, I naively believed I was presenting a desirable alternative to my class when I chose to use a text by Sonia Nieto (1992) which presented alternative world views of twelve students who, according to Nieto, were chosen for their differences from the dominant ("white," European) culture in the United States. Fortunately for me, a "white," male student in my graduate class had the courage to approach me about his reluctance to support many of the underlying tenets in Nieto's book.

My learning experience, a decentering from the overarching perspective of Nieto, came once I encouraged him to articulate his disagreement. His subsequent papers decentered my unquestioning acceptance of Nieto's interpretation of the twelve students' cases contained in the book and of her justification for the why and the how of "affirming diversity," the title of the book. This particular graduate student called into question for me the presentation of only one point of view--that is, the one interpreted by Nieto to come from the positions of those subjugated by virtue of their difference from the dominant culture. The graduate student's questioning allowed me to see how my actions as a teacher created what he believed to be a silencing of his viewpoint, the very phenomenon I hoped to rectify by my choice of a text. From my poststructural, feminist point of view, the question of who was empowered in the events represented by Selection #3 is the wrong question to ask. What is crucial, though, is an understanding of how the relationship produced and may continue to produce decentered knowledge.

Assumption Three: The aim of inquiry is dialogue.

My poststructural, feminist epistemology seeks the conditions which foster creation of a pluralistic forum for dialogue--that is, one in which persons who hold diverse views can decenter their perspectives through dialogue and mutual critique. Thus, a complementary portion of the researcher's or teacher's work necessarily involves the identification of "the kind of equality necessary for dialogue" and the removal of "structural features and barriers that distort or limit open, free dialogue" (Nielsen, 1990, p. 30). This perspective differs from that of openly emancipatory research in the ends presupposed at the beginning. Whereas critical, emancipatory research presupposes the knowledge of which persons are dominant and the end of liberating those who are dominated, my poststructural, feminist position seeks the analysis of how power and knowledge relations produce conditions that create an open forum for dialogue. My perspective realizes that conditions that promote or hinder dialogue depend upon the particular relationship in question. Critical questions are: what kind of relationship will promote dialogue, and what barriers exist in a particular context?

Both journal selections #1 and #3 above illustrate the importance of context

to the creation of conditions that promote true dialogue. In selection #1, parity among colleagues is the necessary condition for the creation of dialogue. In selection #2, trust between student and teacher created an open forum for the exchange of ideas.

One important result that emerged when my university partner and I taught a course to our professional development school colleagues (selection #1) was the realization that the teacher-student relationship is incompatible with the relationship of parity that should exist among school-university collaborators. The power differential inherent in a student-teacher relationship inhibits the dialogue necessary to achieve the authentic collaboration that should exist among professional partners. "Authentic" collaboration is the relationship that exists when participants of the same status conduct mutual planning and goal-setting, thus enabling shared ownership of the goals and subsequent attempts to achieve them (Million & Vare, 1995). Authentic collaboration should necessarily be a condition of partnership relations among university colleagues and school personnel. In contrast, authentic collaboration is automatically precluded in many student-teacher relationships. For that reason, I have personally decided that I will never again agree to teach a course to persons in a school with whom I have special authentic, collaborative relationships, such as that represented by a professional development school. I will agree to inquire as a co-learner but not to serve as an authoritative evaluator. For me as a professor, the dual roles of teacher and collaborator are incompatible when parity is a condition of the collaborative relationship.

In the journal selection represented by #3, "Pedagogy of the Unoppressed," the idea of an authentic relation is never itself in question. The power differential is between student and teacher is acknowledged and accepted at the outset. The student described in selection #3, nonetheless, points out by his actions that trust, as an essential part of the professional student-teacher relationship, enables dialogue to result. The student trusted me to accept his contribution and to judge it on its own merits even if his perspective conflicted with points of view promoted by the choice of readings reflected in the course syllabus. Trust between student and teacher enabled the creation of an open forum for the exchange of ideas.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ethical Implications of School-University Collaboration

In the final section of this paper, I set forth two ethical implications that arise from the complications in school-university collaboration and the assumptions of poststructural, feminist research outlined above. The first ethical implication involves the nature of the collaborative relationship. I argue that it is necessarily a caring one and that the ethical defense of decisions made within that relational context rests in part upon the moral claim of "caring" (Noddings, 1984). The second implication derives from my feminist view of knowledge as gendered, situated, and historically produced. I argue that each collaborator comes from a particular "situated practice" that inevitably contributes to a respective "situated understanding" (Lave, 1990). Thus, democratization of inquiry through inclusion of various collaborators' perspectives is intellectually honest and, therefore, ethically desirable. Finally, I discuss some ways in which caring and democratization of inquiry are bound together in a particular collaborative project.

The collaborative relationship is a caring one.

Ethical issues in collaborative inquiry take place within the context of relationships that can be described in Noddings' (1984) term as "caring" ones; therefore, I base the ethical defense of decisions within that relational context on the moral claim of "caring" as outlined by Nel Noddings (1984) and critiqued by Strike (1990). Noddings' (1984) description of the caring relationship acknowledges that human ethical decisions derive from the contexts of relationships in addition to a hierarchy of abstract principles. As such, an ethic of caring complements, but does not replace, an ethic of justice. Codes of ethics such as that promoted by the American Anthropological Association (1996) outline priorities for researchers' resolution of ethical dilemmas, but these codes are prescriptive, describing what researchers should do rather than setting forth complete rationales about an ethical base. Whether the prescriptions of codes of ethics are based on an underlying ethic of caring or justice is debatable and left largely to conjecture. I argue, though, that care is a ethical accompaniment of the search for understanding and that it ought to

be foremost in our consciousness when we enter a collaborative relationship.

The collaborative relationship is necessarily a caring one in Noddings' (1984) definition of the term. When we embark upon a collaborative encounter, we inevitably enter each other's respective worlds. Noddings (1984; 1992) describes two complementary aspects of a caring relationship, the roles of carer and cared for, with both parties alternating between the two roles. The one-caring engages in two behaviors essential to care--engrossment and displacement of motivation. Engrossment entails full receptivity by the one-caring to the needs of the cared for, and displacement of motivation means that the carer's motivation is for the concerns of the other. Noddings (1984) describes care as essentially "feminine" because it has a "receptive rationality" that makes it integral to a relationship (p. 1). Care is "rooted in receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness" (p. 2). Receptivity in a relationship allows a person to "apprehend another's reality as a possibility" for our own (Kierkegaard cited in Noddings, 1984, p. 14). The condition of receptivity allows one to be "invaded" by another (p. 31) and so to be permanently changed in some way by interactions with the other.

Strike (1990) critiques Noddings' theory of caring, arguing that her ethic is incomplete. Specifically omitted, according to Strike (1992), are discussions of the following: "goods of relationship" such as "love, friendship, and community;" "goods of accomplishment" in various areas of human endeavor; and the area of "justice" or societal norms that "regulate the common life" (p. 216). Strike's critique shows us that decisions based upon an ethic of care can be complicated by their consideration of the goods of relationship and accomplishment and societal norms about relationships.

Care enters the collaborative encounter as part of the relationship and resolution of ethical dilemmas. The situation described in journal selection #2 provides an illustration. My colleague's decision to suppress certain data can be justified by the prescription in a code of ethics that participants should be protected from harm. In addition to this rationale, though, the basis for my colleague's decision derives specifically from the collaborative relationship that emerged in the project. The context that produced the dilemma must be examined in light of the particular relationship that developed between the university researchers and the participants. It was the development of a caring relation that allowed my colleague

to view the potential harm from the perspective of our participants' realities and me to understand the basis for my colleague's decision.

The research relationship itself can take priority over the goal of inquiry. During the research project, an important aspect of our association with our collaborative participants was the creation of a sense of "family" that would allow a sustaining support network to develop. Indeed, our data showed that participants felt a sense of family and support had developed. The circumstances of our research created conditions by which we were "invaded," in Noddings' (1984) sense of the word, by each other's personal and professional lives. In the process of deciding whether to suppress data, my colleague considered the data from the view of the participants and made the decision not to report data related to one particular theme. My colleague's decision can also be examined from the point of view of Strike (1990). Given the sense of family and comradeship that had developed, reporting of data that might cause discomfort for participants could destroy the sense of community and friendship between researchers and participants. In this instance, it is the "goods of relationship" that are endangered by reporting certain data. Strike's (1990) critique allows us to see that the relationship itself has value and that an ethic of care extends to the protection of the "goods" of that relationship. Not only do participants deserve protection from harm, but the collaborative relationship itself warrants protection as a valued "good."

Intellectual honesty demands the democratization of inquiry.

Earlier in this paper I described my evolving view of qualitative inquiry as a search for decentered knowledge that takes place once a forum for open dialogue between and among partners has been created. In school-university collaboration, participants from differing workplace cultures bring their respective situated understandings to a site of joint inquiry in any project. These multiple perspectives require the use of multiple voices in the processes of inquiry, whether in research design, data collection, or data analysis. When inquiry originates from one perspective only, another is necessarily silenced. This silencing need not be construed as intentional or malicious, only acknowledged. The danger lies in assuming the knowledge generated from one perspective to be valid for all, to serve

as an omnipresent narrator when multiple voices are required to tell many stories. We should expect perspectives to differ and come to view them as "partial truths" (Clifford, 1986), each contributing a particular situated understanding to a continuing dialogue about our practice.

Our collaborative search for meaning requires acknowledgement, acceptance, and solicitation of multiple perspectives from the outset. In school-university collaboration, colleagues who come from different workplace cultures initiate inquiry with potentially different goals and questions. In this paper, an earlier discussion showed how school and university collaborators conducted divergent research projects within the same setting (Feldman, 1992). Another paper shows how university researchers, each grounded in divergent disciplinary perspectives and theoretical frames, approached collaborative projects with different research questions and analytic models (Eisenhart & Borko, 1991). These disparities make the collaborative process between persons of differing workplace cultures or disciplinary perspectives seem like a phenomenon in search of an identifying label. Feldman (1992) calls this particular process collaboration through "separation;" Eisenhart and Borko (1991) label it "additive or parallel collaboration" (p. 154). Their labels reflect the condition of disparity inherent in understandings derived from differing situated practices.

Rather than search for a label with which to identify the collaborative process, we might more productively focus our energies on the creation of a democratic form for the exchange of dialogue related to disciplined inquiry about our connected practices. I will use sample research questions generated from one collaborative project to speculate about ethical issues in the democratic construction of such a dialogue. In a curriculum leadership project, two university faculty, two teachers on sabbatical, and 19 public school teachers participated in a summer institute designed to prepare teachers to provide inservice in science and mathematics for other teachers. I was one of two university faculty who participated in the institute. An important aspect of the design of the institute was the establishment of rapport based on trust, equal status, and mutual regard. From the outset, all participants were identified by first name only; no titles, grades and subjects taught, or work locations were used to characterize participants. In addition, on the morning of the first day of the institute, participants completed a four-hour session on a low ropes

course, a feature designed also to enhance rapport.

The following research questions comprise a partial listing of those generated in the collaborative curriculum leadership forum. To select sample questions that represent areas of inquiry voiced by various participants, I reviewed field notes of dialogue occurring during the institute and chose questions that emanate from these perspectives: myself, a university professor invited to help the group design a case study of the collaborative process; a teacher of high school mathematics on sabbatical leave to join the project staff at a local university; the project director, a university professor of science education; a teacher of junior high school science; and two teachers of elementary school science and mathematics. Questions specific to each perspective follow.

Sample Collaborative Research Questions
(Research Project: Systemic Reform of Science and Mathematics Education)

1. From a university professor invited to help conduct the research:

   a. What culture evolves in the curriculum leadership institute? How does this culture evolve? How do participants change, and what is the nature of the change process?

   b. Do participants from the university in the curriculum leadership institutes change their views of themselves as instructional leaders in school-university collaborative settings? If so, how? What are the implications for graduate courses?

2. From a high school mathematics teacher on sabbatical as a systemic change specialist:

   a. What barriers are encountered in getting teachers to change the ways they teach mathematics and science?

   b. What does it mean to "do math" as a discipline? How can we transfer this to students?

   c. How can we use technology as a tool for problem solving rather than as a focus of problem solving?

3. From a university professor of science education, the local director of the systemic change project:

   a. How do teachers decide which science concepts they are going to teach? What guides teachers in making decisions about when to teach certain concepts?

   b. How do teachers decide when to move from concrete experiences to the formal language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of science?

4. From a junior high school teacher of science:

   a. If teachers have to teach less and less and teach it better, how do we make decisions? How do we teach less material better? Should the decisions be based on materials available? Should they be based on time constraints? What ways are there to get around the time constraints? How do we decide?

   b. How do we as teachers develop ways to assess students' learning of process and content skills in alternative ways?

5. From two elementary school teachers of mathematics and science:

   a. How does it make a richer math environment when students come up with their own math word problems? How does this help students develop higher order thinking skills? What if students don't have their books open? What if students think we're not doing math? How do we answer fellow teachers who ask questions such as these?

   b. Should process skills be taught at the beginning of the year or throughout the year?

   c. How do you get people to change? What am I going to do more than I'm already doing to get others to change?

Multiple perspectives are present in this partial list of important questions generated by the participants in the curriculum leadership institute. The questions illustrate the specific nature of situated school or university practice. As depicted here, the elementary teachers are concerned about investigating problems related to working with their own students to teach mathematics word problems and higher order thinking skills. Teachers also have questions related to their new roles as providers of inservice to fellow teachers; areas of inquiry include what barriers exist and how decisions about which content to teach should be made. In contrast, the university professors voice questions related to their specific roles and practices. The question that I generated concerns how university participants are changed by the collaborative process and what effect it has on our roles in graduate classes. The university professor who is a science educator wants to understand how science teachers make the decisions about content in the teaching process.

If we speculate about the democratization of inquiry in this project, several implications arise. First, it is apparent that the process of the institute created a forum in which multiple perspectives were shared. The emergence of research

questions from various points of view is a testimony to the successful removal of the barrier of status and to the creation of a relationship characterized by openness and trust. Suppose, however, that participants were asked to make decisions about which questions to pursue further. If we assume that participants have equal status, questions generated from their various perspectives should also have equal value as potential areas of inquiry. How would or should they decide which questions have priority for research pursuits in a democratic forum? One suggestion might be to use a method of participatory decision making such that each person contributes equally to choices made. A method that uses a ranking rather than a voting procedure allows each person to contribute a relative value to each choice.

A final area of consideration is this. Not only can collaborative inquiry allow decentered knowledge to emerge when participants come to understand each other's situated practice, but collaborative work that blurs the boundaries of status, rank, and territory allows truly shared inquiry to emerge. Shared inquiry is reflected in questions that emerge from participants who now share a specific practice. In the case of the curriculum leadership project, school and university participants share the practice of working together to provide professional development for teachers of science and mathematics. In the questions listed above from the curriculum leadership project, instances of shared inquiry occur. A look at the questions generated by the mathematics specialist and the elementary teachers shows that all are concerned about how to identify and remove barriers to change. A similar instance occurs in comparing the questions of the science educator and the junior high school science teacher. Both have concerns about how science teachers decide what content to teach. Shared inquiry emerges in these two instances because collaborators merge their practice in the mutually owned goal of systemic reform of science and mathematics education.

Conclusion

Ethical issues will inevitably arise in school-university collaborative work. It can be argued that the university partners bear the major responsibility for adhering to standards of accepted ethical conduct since they often initiate inquiry due to the expectations of their workplace cultures. Moreover, it is the university collaborators

who often possess greater power and privilege to arrange space for dialogue, and their motives for joining in dialogue will come under the scrutiny of those who represent the voices of the teacher (Vare, 1995). Lugones and Spelman (1983) argue that the only acceptable motive is that of friendship as a reciprocity of care and understanding.

Research as relationship recognizes that we search for decentered knowledge mindful of our own motives for collaborative inquiry and the concerns of our collaborators and respectful of the collaborative relationship itself. We are caretakers of the human relationship that produces research. To democratize inquiry within an ethical framework, we must ask ourselves the following questions. How does the collaborative relationship itself contribute to the production of decentered knowledge? What conditions produce an equitable relationship? What barriers exist that may hinder dialogue? How do collaborators decide which questions take priority in the pursuit of inquiry? And, finally, how do we safeguard the collaborative relationship itself?

References

American Anthropological Association Committee on Ethics. (1996, April). Final report of the commission to review the AAA statements on ethics. Anthropology Newsletter, 37 (4), 13-15.

Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1990). School-university collaboration: Different workplace cultures. Contemporary Education, 61 (3), 125-128.

Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1992). School-university collaboration: Across cultures. Teaching Education, 4 (2), 53-68.

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial truths. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography (pp. 1-26). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eastwood, C. (Producer and Director). (1987). Heartbreak ridge. [Film]. (Available from Warner Bros. Inc., 4000 Warner Blvd., Burbank, CA 91522)

Eisenhart, M. A., & Borko, H. (1991). In search of an interdisciplinary collaborative design for studying teacher education. Teaching & Teacher Education, 7 (2), 137-157.

Fear, K. L. (1991). A critical analysis of collaboration within professional development schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Palm Springs, CA.

Feldman, A. (1992). Models of equitable collaboration between university researchers and school teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977, (pp. 109-133). New York: Pantheon Books.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gore, J. (1992). What can we do for you! What can "we" do for "you"? Struggling over empowerment in critical and feminist pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), Feminisms and critical pedagogy, (pp. 54-73). New York: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from

women's lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kitchener, K. S. (1988). Dual role relationships: What makes them so problematic? Journal of Counseling and Development, 67 (4), 217-221.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (3), 257-277.

Lave, J. (1990). The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding. In J. W. Stigler, R. A. Shweder, & G. Herdt (Eds.), Cultural psychology: Essays on comparative human development, (pp. 309-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lugones, M. C., & Spelman, E. V. (1983). Have we got a theory for you! Feminist theory, cultural imperialism and the demand for 'the woman's voice." Women's Studies International Forum, 6, 573-581.

Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). (1992). Introduction. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), Feminisms and critical pedagogy, (pp. 1-14). NY: Routledge.

Million, S., & Vare, J. (1994). School and university collaboration: Bridging the cultural and value gaps. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council of States, Charleston, SC.

Million, S., & Vare, J. (1995). The collaborative school: Creating a hybrid culture in a professional development school. Paper presented at the Kappa Delta Pi 40th Biennial Convocation, Birmingham, AL.

Nielsen, J. M. (1990). Introduction. In J. M. Nielsen (Ed.), Feminist research methods: Exemplary readings in the social sciences, (pp. 1-37) . Boulder: Westview Press.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education (2nd ed.). NY: Longman.

Noddings, Nel. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Noddings, Nel. (1992). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education. Teachers College Press.

Parish, R., Underwood, E., & Eubanks, E. E. (1986-87). We do not make change: School-university collaboration. Metropolitan Education, 3 (44-55).

Roman, L. G., & Apple, M. W. (1990). Is naturalism a move away from positivism? Materialist and feminist approaches to subjectivity in ethnographic research. In E. W. Eisner and A. Peshkin (eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate, (pp. 38-73). NY: Teachers College Press.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. Educational Policy, 7 (1), 5-23.

Strike, K. A. (1990). The legal and moral responsibility of teachers. In J. I. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. A. Sirotnik (eds.)., The moral dimensions of teaching, (pp. 188-223). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Teitel, L. (1991). Getting started: Issues in initiating new models for school and university collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Vare, J. (1995). Gendered ideology: Voices of parent and practice in teacher education. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 26 (3), 251-278.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE